



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,677	12/21/2001	Scott R. Swix	36968.267873 (BS01421)	4979
23552	7590	10/06/2003	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			BUI, KIEU OANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,677

Applicant(s)

SWIX ET AL.

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/11/02 was filed after the mailing date of the application 09/687,139 on 12/21/01. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The method of --claim 4-- should be corrected as --claim 5-- instead, because “the viewer’s action log” referred to herein, it does not exist either in claim 4 or in claim 1 but in claim 5. Appropriate correction is required. (For the purpose of examination, Examiner assumes that claim 6 depends on claim 5)

3. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: The method of --claim 6-- should be corrected as --claim 8--instead, because “the set top box” referred to herein, it does not exist in claim 6 but claim 8. Appropriate correction is required. (For the purpose of examination, Examiner assumes that claim 9 depends on claim 8)

4. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: The method of --claim 1-- should be corrected as --claim 2--instead, because “the incentive” referred to herein, it does not exist in claim 1 but in claim 2. Appropriate correction is required. (For the purpose of examination, Examiner assumes that claim 10 depends on claim 2)

5. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: wherein --the network programming--should be corrected as --the media programming--to further clarify the claim language. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.*

7. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grossman (U.S. Patent PUB No. 2002/0032906 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Grossman discloses “a method for evaluating a viewer watching programming”, i.e., the information delivery system monitors and evaluates a viewer watching as the viewer chooses to watch a promotional program from an advertiser (page 1, section 0012), comprising the steps of: “prompting the viewer during a television programming stream to provide an indicated response to an event within an indicated time period”, i.e., a television program broadcasted to the viewer via cable set top boxes or satellite television systems for digital communications (page 2, section 0024), wherein television programming contains streaming video delivered to the viewer (page 2, section 0025) and the viewer has a time period to response to an event offered as the prompting from the advertiser (page 3, section 0032-0033

for time-scheduled activities and special offers, and Fig. 2a for the routine process to determine whether the viewer select any choice within the offer time period); “detecting the indicated response to the event; measuring a response time of the indicated response to the event; and evaluating viewer performance based upon the response time”, i.e., the system can detect and track the viewer’s response, and evaluating viewer performance to determine the response time, by rewarding the viewer accordingly (page 4, sections 0041 & 0042 & 0045).

As for claim 2, in view of claim 1, Grossman further discloses “providing an incentive to the viewer based upon the viewer's performance”, i.e., an incentive such as special offers, discounts, coupons, sweepstakes etc. is provided to the viewer based on the viewer’s performance as taking part in the promotion program or viewing the promo program (page 3, section 0032 and page 5, section 0053).

As for claim 3, in view of claim 1, Grossman inherently discloses “wherein the event comprises an occurrence of audio/visual content broadcast to the viewer during the television programming stream”, i.e., television programming contains audio/video content broadcasted to the viewer from cable television system or satellite television system in digital communications comprising video streaming including (understood) audio (page 1, section 0012; page 2, section 0024 & 0025; and page 4, section 0041).

As for claim 5, in view of claim 1, Grossman further discloses “comprising creating a viewer action's log from the indicated response and the response time”, i.e., viewer profile and viewer’s action log for viewer’s responses and the response time are created and kept at the administration system (as illustrated in Fig. 1 at the Administration for community management consisting of member activity monitoring, profile administration and Agency Services with

accounting/billing; and Fig. 5 with viewer profiles, viewer history, commercial viewing history with prime channel etc. with date/time and scheduled time are tracked, see page 3, section 0032 & 0034; page 4, sections 0041, 0042, 0045; and page 5, section 0053 as a good example for this concern).

As for claim 6, in further view of the Objection above (and the Examiner assumes that this claim is depending on claim 5 instead), Grossman further discloses “comprising comparing the viewer's action log to a known sequence of events”, i.e., the system keeps track the number of times the viewer access to a commercial program (page 4, section 0047) and a known sequence of events, for instance, the one hundredth viewer of a commercial program can be tracked and awarded with prizes (page 5, section 0053).

As for claim 7, in view of claim 1, Grossman further discloses “wherein the television programming stream comprises an advertisement”, i.e., television programming stream containing digital video streaming including promotion program or commercial or an advertisement (page 1/section 0012 and page 2/section 0025).

As for claim 10, in further view of the Objection above, Grossman further discloses “wherein the incentive comprises at least one of: an award, a coupon, a discount, and a prize” (page 3/section 0032 and page 5/section 0053).

As for claim 11, in view of claim 1, Grossman further discloses “comprising transmitting the indicated response and the response time to a data-center”, i.e., viewer profile and viewer's action log for viewer's responses and the response time are transmitted or collected and kept at the administration system regarding as a data center (Figs. 5-6, and page 4/section 0042).

As for claim 12, in view of claim 1, Grossman further discloses “wherein the evaluating performance step comprises instant feedback to the viewer”, i.e., an instant reward as a feedback is provided to the viewer (page 4/sections 0041 & 0042).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0032906 A1) in view of Trewitt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,531).

Regarding claim 4, in view of claim 1, Grossman does not disclose the step of “time-stamping the indicated response to the event”; however, in a same environment of a technique of collecting the viewer’s response in exchange for a reward, Trewitt teaches the step of “time-stamping the indicated response to the event”, i.e., a response from the viewer/user can be time-stamped accordingly and accurately for the synchronization between the system and the viewer (Fig. 6, col. 4/lines 52-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman’s system with Trewitt’s time-stamping technique in order to synchronizing the audience or the viewer’s interactions to the broadcast program segments accordingly and accurately. The motivation for doing this is to

offer accurately correlate reactions to specific program segments of the program so that variations of the reactions or responses over time can be taken into consideration for other purposes, for instance, rewarding correctly to whom at what time, as suggested by Trewitt (see col. 1/lines 20-35, and col. 1/line 64 to col. 2/line 5).

10. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0032906 A1) in view of Rosser (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,261 B1). As for claim 8, in view of claim 1, Grossman does not disclose: "wherein the indicated response to the event is provided by the viewer actuating a pushbutton key on a set-top box remote control unit which transmits an encoded signal when the viewer identifies the occurrence of audio/visual content"; however, Rosser teaches an exact technique as Rosser's set top box receives and transmits encoded television signals using a remote controller 71 so that the viewer actuating a pushbutton key on a set-top box remote control unit which transmits an encoded signal when the viewer identifies the occurrence of audio/visual content (col. 8/line 56 to col. 9/line 30 for programs in the form of encoded signals are handled at the viewer usage profile of the set top box; and col. 13/lines 13-48 as a video feed with an advertisement can be encoded). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman's system with a set top box as one of Rosser in order to handle encoded signals at the set top box as the viewer identifies the occurrence of audio/video content and selects the suitable video/audio stream using the remote controller 71 as suggested by Rosser (Fig. 2, and col. 7/line 59 to col. 8/line 18).

As for claim 9, in further view of the objection above (and the Examiner assumes this claim is depending on claim 8 instead of claim 6), Grossman does not disclose “wherein the set-top box is operable for monitoring viewing habits and actions, collecting information, and receiving encoded television signals”; however, Rosser teaches an exact technique as Rosser’s set top box can monitor, collect and gather a viewer’s habits and other information at the set top box, and it handles encoded television signals (Fig. 2/item 74 for a viewer usage profile, col. 3/line 45 to col. 4/line 14 and col. 7/line 45 to col. 8/line 38 for viewer profile; and col. 8/line 56 to col. 9/line 30 for programs in the form of encoded signals are received at the viewer usage profile of the set top box). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman’s system with a set top box as one of Rosser in order to monitor, collect and gather the viewer’s information or profile at the set top box for the system to determine on better and appropriately targeting advertisements of product or service based on the viewer’s preference as suggested by Rosser (col. 3/line 63 to col. 4/line 30).

11. Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0032906 A1) in view of Trewitt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,134,531) and Rosser (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,261 B1).

Regarding claim 13, Grossman discloses “a media delivery device for evaluating a viewer watching programming”, i.e., the information delivery apparatus monitors and evaluates a viewer watching as the viewer chooses to watch a promotional program from an advertiser (page 1, section 0012), comprising “a decoder operable for decoding broadcast media programming

into the media delivery device, wherein the broadcast media programming comprises an occurrence of audio/visual cues”, i.e., a cable set top box serves as a decoder for decoding digital streams from the broadcast media (Grossman, page 2/section 0024, and page 4/section 0041 for stream video regarding as an occurrence of audio/visual cues); and “evaluating the viewer's response and the response time by comparing the viewer's response and the response time against any known sequence of events”, i.e., the control system keeps track the number of times the viewer access to a commercial program (page 4, section 0047) and a known sequence of events, for instance, the one hundredth viewer of a commercial program can be tracked to determine the response time so that awarded with prizes based on the viewer response and response time (page 5, section 0053).

Grossman does not disclose “a timed response monitoring module operable for measuring a response time of the viewer's response”; however, in a same environment of a technique of collecting the viewer's response in exchange for a reward, Trewitt teaches that a response from the viewer/user can be time-stamped accordingly and accurately for the synchronization between the system and the viewer (Fig. 6, col. 4/lines 52-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman's apparatus with Trewitt's time-stamping technique by placing that time-stamp unit within a timed response monitoring module in the information delivery apparatus in order to synchronize the audience or the viewer's interactions to the broadcast program segments accordingly and accurately. The motivation for doing this is to offer accurately correlate reactions to specific program segments of the program so that variations of the reactions or responses over time can be taken into consideration for other purposes, for instance, rewarding

correctly to whom at what time, as suggested by Trewitt (see col. 1/lines 20-35, and col. 1/line 64 to col. 2/line 5).

Grossman disclose that the step of evaluating is operated by “a processor”, but does not disclose the step of “a viewer action's module operable for detecting a viewer's response to the occurrence of audio/visual cues”; however, Rosser teaches an exact technique as Rosser's set top box includes a processor for operating (Fig. 4/item 146) in monitoring, collecting and gathering a viewer's habits and other information at the set top box and including viewer action's module 170 for storing user profile based on the user's response to the occurrence of audio/visual cues, or namely, the video stream or data stream (Rosser, Fig. 4/item 170 and col. 3/line 45 to col. 4/line 14 for a viewer usage profile; and col. 7/line 45 to col. 8/line 38 for viewer profile with video streams as MPEG2 and other compressed video transmitted to the viewer based on the viewer's profile). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman's apparatus with a set top box as one of Rosser in order to operate with a processor, and the processor monitors, collects and gathers the viewer's information or profile at the set top box within the viewer action's module or user profile 170 for the system to determine on better and appropriately targeting advertisements of product or service based on the viewer's preference as suggested by Rosser (col. 3/line 63 to col. 4/line 30).

As for claim 14, in view of claim 13, Grossman, Rosser, and Trewitt further discloses comprising: “a network connection operable for transmitting encoded signals between the media delivery device and an external network”, i.e., a modem 138 or cable modem 140 or tuner 142 or a decoder 144 for network connections to external network (Rosser, Fig. 4, and col. 1/line 65 to

col. 2/line 8 for the Internet network connection); and the step of “wherein the media delivery device receives prompts from the external network, and the external network receives notification for the viewer's response and the response time” is taught by Grossman, i.e., a television program broadcasted to the viewer via cable set top boxes or satellite television systems for digital communications (page 2, section 0024), wherein television programming contains streaming video delivered to the viewer (page 2, section 0025) and the viewer has a time period to response to an event offered as the prompting from the advertiser (page 3, section 0032-0033 for time-scheduled activities and special offers, and Fig. 2a for the routine process to determine whether the viewer select any choice within the offer time period).

As for claim 15, in view of claim 13, Grossman, Rosser, and Trewitt further discloses “wherein an incentive is provided to the viewer based upon the viewer's response and the response time”, i.e., Grossman teaches an incentive such as special offers, discounts, coupons, sweepstakes etc. is provided to the viewer based on the viewer's performance as taking part in the promotion program or taking time in viewing the promotional program (page 3, section 0032 and page 5, section 0053).

As for claim 16, in view of claim 13 and the objection above, Grossman, Rosser, and Trewitt discloses “wherein the (network) programming comprises an advertisement”, i.e., Grossman further discloses a television programming stream containing digital video streaming including promotion program or commercial or an advertisement (page 1/section 0012 and page 2/section 0025).

As for claim 17, in view of claim 13, Grossman does not disclose: “wherein the viewer's response to the occurrence of audio/visual cues is provided by the viewer actuating a pushbutton

key on a set-top box remote control unit which transmits an encoded signal when the viewer identifies the occurrence of audio/visual cues”; however, Rosser teaches an exact technique as Rosser’s set top box receives and transmits encoded television signals using a remote controller 71 (col. 8/line 56 to col. 9/line 30 for programs in the form of encoded signals are handled at the viewer usage profile of the set top box; and col. 13/lines 13-48 as a video feed with an advertisement can be encoded; and the video stream or data stream regarding as audio/visual cues as discussed in claim 13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman’s system with a set top box as one of Rosser in order to handle encoded signals at the set top box as the viewer identifies the occurrence of audio/video stream and selects the suitable video/audio stream using the remote controller 71 as suggested by Rosser (Fig. 2, and col. 7/line 59 to col. 8/line 18).

As for claim 18, in view of claim 17, Grossman does not further disclose: “wherein the set-top-box is operable for monitoring viewing habits and actions, collecting information, and receiving encoded television signals”; however, Rosser teaches an exact technique as Rosser’s set top box can monitor, collect and gather a viewer’s habits and other information at the set top box, and it handles encoded television signals (Fig. 2/item 74 for a viewer usage profile, col. 3/line 45 to col. 4/line 14 and col. 7/line 45 to col. 8/line 38 for viewer profile; and col. 8/line 56 to col. 9/line 30 for programs in the form of encoded signals are received at the viewer usage profile of the set top box). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman’s system with a set top box as one of Rosser in order to monitor, collect and gather the viewer’s information or profile at the set top box for the system to determine on better and appropriately targeting advertisements of product

or service based on the viewer's preference as suggested by Rosser (col. 3/line 63 to col. 4/line 30).

12. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0032906 A1) in view Trewitt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,134,531).

Regarding claim 19, Grossman discloses "a method for providing an incentive to a television viewer", i.e., an incentive such as special offers, discounts, coupons, sweepstakes etc. is provided to the viewer based on the viewer's performance as taking part in the promotion program or viewing the promo program (Grossman, page 3, section 0032 and page 5, section 0053), comprising the steps of: "inserting an occurrence of an audio/visual cue into a television broadcasting stream", i.e., Grossman discloses that promotional video is delivered to the viewer at a scheduled date and time (page 3/section 0034 & 0035); therefore, the visual cue, i.e., the promotional visual (cue) will be inserted within the transmission stream over the network during the transmission step.

Grossman further discloses "receiving an indicated response from the television viewer to the occurrence of the audio/visual cue", i.e., the viewer selects the special promo video or an offer from the system in the form of video stream (interpreted for the occurrence of audio/visual cues), and the system detects this indicated response from the viewer (Grossman, page 4/sections 0041 & 0042). Grossman does not teach the step of "time-stamping the indicated response" and "comparing the time-stamped indicated response to a known sequence of events"; however, in a same environment of a technique of collecting the viewer's response in exchange for a reward,

Trewitt teaches that a response from the viewer/user can be time-stamped accordingly and accurately for the synchronization between the system and the viewer (Fig. 6, col. 4/lines 52-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grossman's system with Trewitt's time-stamping technique in order to synchronizing the audience or the viewer's interactions to the broadcast program segments accordingly and accurately due to a known sequence of events as taught by Grossman with an example of the one hundredth viewer of a commercial program can be tracked and awarded with prizes (page 5, section 0053). The motivation for doing this is to offer accurately correlate reactions to specific program segments of the program so that variations of the reactions or responses over time can be taken into consideration for other purposes, for instance, rewarding correctly to whom at what time, as suggested by Trewitt (see col. 1/lines 20-35, and col. 1/line 64 to col. 2/line 5) and to a sequence of events as taught by Grossman.

Based on the time-stamp technique of Trewitt as taught, the combination of Grossman and Trewitt teaches the step of "rewarding viewer behavior based upon the comparison of the time-stamped indicated response to the known sequence of events", i.e., Trewitt teaches that a response from the viewer/user can be time-stamped accordingly and accurately for the synchronization between the system and the viewer (Fig. 6, col. 4/lines 52-67), and Grossman with an example of the one hundredth viewer of a commercial program can be tracked and awarded with prizes (page 5, section 0053) shows that a reward is issued based on a number of times --keeping track by the time stamp technique-- that the viewer selects or views a promotional video.

As for claim 20, in view of claim 19, Grossman further discloses "wherein the reward comprises an incentive, a discount, a coupon, and a prize" (page 3/section 0032 and page 5/section 0053).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Goldstein (US Pat. No.5,410,326) discloses a programmable of remote control device for interacting with a plurality of remotely controlled devices.

Herz et al. (US Pat. No.5,758,257) disclose a system and method for scheduling broadcast and access to video programs and other data using customer profiles.

Ulman et al. (US 2002/0035600 A1) disclose an enhanced video programming system and method for incorporating and displaying retrieved integrated internet information segments.

Del Sesto et al. (US Pat. No.6,530,082 B1) disclose a configurable monitoring of program viewership and usage of interactive applications.

Haseltine et al. (US 2002/0049967 A1) disclose a processes for exploiting electronic tokens to increase broadcasting revenue.

Yassin et al. (US 2003/0110497 A1) disclose a micro-auction on television using multiple rewards to benefit the viewer of commercials.

Jones (US Pat. No.5,500,681) discloses an apparatus and method for generating product coupons in response to televised offers.

13. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
September 25, 2003



**KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER 7**